

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 8, 15, 20, 24 and 27 have been amended. The amendments are supported by specification as filed, for example at ¶ 0023. No new matter is added.

All of the present claims are patentable over Marler et al. (US Patent Application 2001/0003212) and are further patentable over Mao et al. (US 6,459,427) even when considered in combination with Marler or Zdepski et al. (US 6,006,256).

Marler describes a mechanism of transmitting ancillary information as well as information used to identify the ancillary information along with video data. However, Marler neither teaches nor suggests creating an integrated video data stream by integrating interactive content with a video data stream in response to one or more triggers based on one or more rules, as presently claimed. One of the ways Marler transmits ancillary information with television content is by using ATVEF specification-compliant techniques. Marler ¶ 0003. In accordance with the ATVEF specification, enhancement data added to the transmission may include ATVEF announcement, a resource and a trigger. “The three components may be transmitted using IP multicast to the receiver.” Marler ¶ 0020. Thus, the triggers discussed by Marler are simply components of enhancement data that are added to the video stream. They are not triggers based on one or more rules that trigger the automatic creation of video data stream that can be transmitted to receivers. In other words, the triggers discussed by Marler are just part of the interactive content and are used to enable interactivity by synchronizing enhancement data with the TV transmission. Marler ¶ 0021. Importantly, there is no integrated video data stream being created by integrating interactive content with a video data stream in response to one or more triggers based on one or more rules, where integrated video data stream is subsequently transmitted to receivers, as presently claimed.

The Office Action concedes that Mao neither teaches nor suggests creating integrated video data stream by integrating interactive content with a video data stream in response to one or

more triggers based on one or more rules, as presently claimed. As discussed above, Marler also fails to cure this deficiency. Thus, the combination of Mao and Marler also fails to teach the above limitation.

Likewise, Zdepski neither teaches nor suggests creating integrated video data stream by integrating interactive content with a video data stream in response to one or more triggers based on one or more rules, as presently claimed. Zdepski describes a mechanism to add interactive programming to a television signal prior to broadcasting. In Zdepski, the triggers discussed are part of the interactive content included in the stream (much like the triggers discussed by Marler) and are not triggers based on one or more rules, in response to which triggers interactivity is integrated in a video data stream, as claimed. Consequently, adding the teaching of Zdepski to those of Mao fails to yield the presently claimed invention.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the present claims are patentable over the cited references, whether considered alone or in combination with one another as proposed in the Office Action.

If there are any additional fees due in connection with this communication, please charge our deposit account 19-3140

Respectfully submitted,

SONNENSCHEN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

Dated: March 14, 2008

/Tarek N. Fahmi/

Tarek N. Fahmi

Reg. No. 41,402

PO Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
650-798-0320